

### Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing the claims.

Applicant has amended claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 18, and 19 by deleting the words "non-java" where they appeared within the phrase "the non-java content." These claims depend directly from claim 1 or from an intervening claim that depends from claim 1. Claim 1 recites "content" multiple times, but does not recite "non-java content." The phrase "non java content" in claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 18, and 19 did not have proper antecedent basis. The Examiner did not address this error, but Applicant is bringing the error to the attention of the Office. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.312, Applicant respectfully requests that an Examiner consider and enter this amendment.

In the office action mailed November 17, 2008, the Examiner indicated that the information disclosure statements filed on February 20, 2008 and May 1, 2008 have been considered. Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering these information disclosure statements. Applicant has not received and the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system does not include an initialed and signed copy of the information disclosure statement filed on May 1, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide for the record an initialed and signed copy of the information disclosure statement filed on May 1, 2008 so as to show which references cited on the information disclosure statement have been considered.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: July 10, 2009

By: /David L. Ciesielski/  
David L. Ciesielski  
Reg. No. 57,432